Ups and Downs of the Third Season at the Manhattan

Mr. Hammerstein Increases the Scheduled Hundred by Four Special Performances at Advanced Prices

By H. E. KREHBIEL

CHAPTER VIII

THE third season of grand opera at the Manhattan Opera House began on November 9, 1908, and ended on March 27, 1909. During this period of twenty weeks there were five regular performances a week, for which subscriptions had been invited in June. Had the rule been strictly followed the season would have been compassed by 100 representations; but advantage was taken in accordance with New York custom, on occasions which seemed auspicious, such as popular holidays and the advent of a sensational novelty, to add four to the number of representations. In the case of the quasi-novelty, in this case Richard Strauss's "Salome," which had been flamboyantly advertised by the circumstances attending its production and withdrawal at the Metropolitan Opera House in the season of 1906-'07, Mr. Hammerstein took occasion to prove the disinterestedness of his aims and the sincerity of his protestations by raising the price of admission on its first performance.

This proceeding, in which he was but following the example of his rival, may, I suppose, be looked upon as a venial sin. The public was used to it and expected nothing else. Looked at in the light thrown on it by some of the incidents of the rivalry between the opera houses, however, it becomes worthy of comment for instruction in righteousness if not for reproof. If we could but believe the asseverations put forth by the managers of the contending opera houses, there never was a period in the history of opera in which managerial altruism reached such a noble height as it did during the years of rivalry between the Metropolitan and Manhattan establishments. The dear public's consuming hunger for opera was to be gratified and its taste uplifted no matter what sacrifices of money were entailed by the devoted purveyors of the costly entertainment. Nevertheless, every opportunity to exploit popular curiosity concerning a new work was seized upon as an excuse for a representation outside of the subscription and at advanced prices of admission. This proceeding, together with a system of brigandage practised by the box offices in collusion with the ticket speculators, made the people pay a great deal more for their luxury than a glance at the official prospectuses would lead one to conclude. In a few years it also led to some scandalous doings involving the Metropolitan company, which led up to the gates of a prison and ought to have penetrated them. Of that I shall speak later.

Mr. Hammerstein's administration gave fewer instances of such exploiting of the public than did that of his rivals, but the reason might be found, probably, in the fact that he was not blessed by so large a list of subscribers that the general public looked upon the opportunity to enjoy the first night of a novelty as a gracious benison. Besides, he had Philadelphia on his hands. His double-headed enterprise had reached such a stage of forwardness when he put forth his first extended announcement of the season that his new opera house was building and his companies were engaged.

In June, 1908, he informed the public through the newspapers that the New York and Philadelphia houses were to be separate and distinct establishments so far as orchestra, chorus, ballet and working personnel were concerned, but would be united in "jubilee" performances in both cities, "the like of which had never been attempted in any part of the world." He had retained Cleofonte Campanini as conductor for New York and engaged Signor Sturani, of Rome, as conductor for Philadelphia. His principal singers were to be Mmes. Melba, Tetrazzini, Maria Labia, Doria, Mariska Aldrich, Gerville-Reache, Garden, Augustinelli, Zepilli, Trentini, Penzano and Severina, and Messrs. Zenatello, Dalmores, Renaud, Sammarco, Gilibert, Dufranne and Arimondi, the majority of whom were known and some of them greatly and deservedly admired by the New York public.

He Announces "Grand Opera Pantomime"

"Taking great pleasure in coming into conflict with traditions in grand opera," he announced with a flourish his intention to introduce a novelty which had "never before been tried anywhere," namely, "grand opera pantomime," which was to take the place of ballets when short operas were given. He had discovered the authors of such pantomimes and purposed to lift them and the art-form out of the obscurity which had thitherto surrounded them. "Salome" was to be produced in a "chaste, sublime and impressive manner." He had purchased 35,000 yards of canvas for scenery in Glasgow, and before July 1 would set 300 costume makers at work on his theatrical wardrobe. His weekly salary list in the two houses was to exceed $75,000.

I do not set forth these things because I think them diverting, but because they comport with my purpose to show a picture of the times. Had Mr. Hammerstein not been humored in the belief that such circus "touting" was tolerable to the public he would not have indulged it. Had the newspapers had an equally poor opinion of the intelligence and taste of their readers they would not have printed it without commenting on its vulgar grandiloquence. It was really for their benefit that the tone was adopted, for when Mr. Hammerstein issued his official prospectus it was found to contain nothing of this fulminant fanfaronnade; its proclamations were succinct and dignified. Decorum marked even his promises touching the ballet pantomimes; but when Mlle. Odette Valery, a dancer who was to be the wonderful interpreter of the wonderful works with which he was to amaze the town, arrived in New York the newspapers entertained their readers with an account of the two cobras and an asp which were booked to make their first appearance with the lady in "Samson et Dalila." The dancer did make a show of the snakes, I believe, in a few performances, but nothing more was heard of the pantomimes.

In his prospectus Mr. Hammerstein specifically promised to produce "Samson et Dalila," by Saint-Saëns; "Salome," by Richard Strauss; "Le Jongleur de Nôtre Dame" and "Griselidis," by Massènet, and "Princesse d'Auberge," by Jan Block. He brought all of them except "Griselidis." In the list which he was less specifically bound to perform were Massènet's "Manon," Bizet's "Les Pecheurs des Perles," Verdi's "Falstaff," Breton's "Dolores," Giordano's "Andrea Chenier" and "Siberia," Donizetti's "Linda di Chamounix," Verdi's "Un Ballo in Maschera" and "Ernani," all of which fell by the board. The chief features of interest were the novelties and the singing of Mme. Melba in "La Bohème," "Otello" and "Rigoletto," between December 14 and January 11, which was the period of her engagement.

In Mr. Hammerstein's preceding season the chief deficiency in his forces was in the women's contingent. This was measurably made good by the presence in the new company of Mlle. Labia, who effected her American début on the opening night in "Tosca." The lady had not only youthfulness and loveliness of form and feature to commend her, but also youthfulness and loveliness of voice and a fine complement of dramatic talent. Her facial expressions, movements, gestures and poses all published a vitality which made one harmony with her vibrant vocal expression. There was fine metal in her voice and much emotional color. In quality it reminded me frequently of Calvé's voice when it was in its prime, especially in the higher register, and it was given out with greater spontaneity.

"Samson et Dalila" Proves Its Dramatic Vitality

A production of historical interest was that of "Samson et Dalila," on November 13. The music of this opera was familiar to the New York public from frequent performances in concert style since its first production sixteen years before by the Oratorio Society. Once within this period an attempt had been made to give it dramatic representation. This was on February 8, 1895, when it was brought forward at the Metropolitan Opera House for the purpose of displaying the physical and vocal strenuousness of Signor Tamagno. There were hopes then that the opera might be added to the repertory of the lyric playhouse in Broadway, but they went down with the ruins of Dagon's temple in the last act. Mr. Hammerstein's performance showed that despite the predominantly oratorio character of much of its music the work has considerable dramatic vitality, and since its revival at the Metropolitan Opera House, in the season of 1915-'16, it has remained in the effective repertory of that establishment, though largely through the agency of Signor Caruso.

The first real novelty of the season was "Le Jongleur de Nôtre Dame," which had its first performance in America on November 27, 1908. The old tradition of the monk, who in his youth had been a juggler and who, while his artistic companions were practising their arts within the walls of the monastery, sought to do honor to the Virgin Mother by performing his mountebank tricks in secret before her altar, was put into shape for M. Massènet by Maurice Lena. It is a quaint and lovable tale. The mixture of devotion and the arts characteristic of the monastic life of the Middle Ages provided an unusual but nevertheless inviting background for an opera. Its obvious drawback lay in the fact that it afforded no opportunity for the introduction of the female voice, for there was no way in which the element of love between man and woman, which has been the most pervasive motive for dramatic writing since the art began, could be introduced into it without spoiling the tale. For Miss Garden's sake, we were told (though I am still skeptical on the point), M. Massènet rewrote the part of Jean.

The device might have added a desirable variety to the music had it been intrusted for execution to a better singer than Miss Garden, or an actress more imbued with a sense of the ingenuous pathos of the story. Under the circumstances of the performances I could but regret the change. The affecting note of sincerity, which provides a potent charm in the mediæval tale, was turned into a dissonant note by the lady's silly by-play during M. Renaud's touching recital of the legend of the sage-bush, which is one of the gems of the score. The first impression created in me by the music was that it was more ingenious than inspired. It suggested an exaggerated eclecticism ranging from the modern French to the ancient ecclesiastical styles with somewhat abrupt transitions from one style to another.

On January 19, 1909, Mr. Hammerstein informed the public through the newspapers that he had engaged Lina Cavalieri for his company. The lady, better endowed with physical charms than artistic, had been a member of the Metropolitan company in the previous season and was now conducting a "beauty shop" in Fifth Avenue. "Salome" was in preparation at the Manhattan, and its production was expected within ten days. Mr. Hammerstein said that he could not expect more from Miss Garden than the performances of "Salome" and "Pélléas et Mélisande" for several weeks and that he had enlisted Miss Cavalieri's services especially for "Thais," an opera which had become popular and which he wanted to keep in his list.

Thereby he opened another chapter in New York's Operatic Book of Scandal. Miss Garden at once made a vigorous protest against the assignment of a part which she had created in America to Miss Cavalieri. Both singers had appeared in the opera in Paris, Miss Cavalieri having been the heroine at its most recent revival there; but the lady who was born in Scotland and brought up in the United States was of the opinion that an Italian lady brought up in Europe would not properly represent a courtesan of ancient Alexandria as conceived by a group of French authors. Miss Garden therefore promptly hired a lawyer to protect her monopoly of the privilege of displaying her physical charms with the scantiest garments allowable to the public gaze. Mr. Hammerstein had covenanted with Miss Cavalieri (and the public by announcement) that the inestimable privilege should be Miss Cavalieri's also; but the contract proved to be in a double sense *nudum pactum*. Miss Garden had her lawyer; Mr. Hammerstein a press agent.

The case was taken to that public forum, the newspapers. Miss Garden served notice on her manager that she had summarily severed her connection with his company. The manager capitulated without more ado. Miss Cavalieri asked that the opera be stricken from her list in a letter which was printed on the morning of the day when the opera was repeated with Miss Garden in the character of the Alexandrian woman who had lived a life of harlotry and died the death of a saint. She renewed her contract with Mr. Hammerstein, who agreed that thenceforth as long as she was engaged by him no one but she should appear at his performances in any new character which she had created except with her consent in writing.

Both ladies were engaged for the next season, when Miss Cavalieri had an opportunity to enact the part of Massenet's Salome in "Herodiade," a woman of a different type than that conceived by Richard Strauss and begotten by Oscar Wilde.

The season was less than a month old, however, when another aspirant for the mingled roses and penitential weeds of Anatole France's heroine appeared on the scene. This was Miss Carmen Melis (whose name should have justified her art), who said that she wanted to show what she could do with Thais, and could not see why the part should be held in trust by any singer. Miss Garden disposed of the presumptuous newcomer in short order by informing Mr. Hammerstein (of course, through that favorite medium of communication between artists and managers, the newspapers) that the moment any singer other than she sang the part she would walk out of the theatre. The opera was sung six times in 1909-'10, but Miss Garden remained the only Thais known to New York until November 25, 1913, when Miss Lois Ewell appeared in the part in the Century Theatre. Miss Farrar threw her garments into the ring at the Metropolitan Opera House on February 16, 1917. Once again in this season Mr. Hammerstein tempted the fates as embodied in the redoubtable Scottish woman. He asked her permission to perform "Le Jongleur de Nôtre Dame" in its original form—that is, with a man singer in the part of Jean. She gave her consent and even said that she would buy a box and witness the performance; but when Mr. Devries made a success in the part Miss Garden exacted and obtained an apology from her manager.

In the moment of Miss Garden's triumph in the "Thais" affair members of the journalistic areopagus became involved in the quarrel. The story had gone out among the gossips of the press that Mr. Hammerstein had been paid to offer the delectable privilege in controversy to Miss Cavalieri. "The New York Press" sent two reporters to the manager, who asked him if the story was true. Mr. Hammerstein ejected them from his office and used language in a letter to the managing editor of the paper which was highly reprehensible in him and highly derogatory to the reporters. Thereupon the two reporters, accompanied by their managing editor, sought Mr. Hammerstein in upper Broadway and, coming upon him as he was leaving the Knickerbocker Hotel, demanded an apology. He refused to make it and they fell upon him, smote him with their fists *pi et armis*, landing several blows upon his body. For this Mr. Hammerstein caused their arrest on a criminal charge.

The next day there were two physical collisions between the newspaper men and Mr. Arthur Hammerstein, who had been challenged to a trial at fisticuffs by the managing editor and had accepted the gage as the champion of his father. The first violent meeting took place outside the police court at which the criminal charge was to be tried; the second within its walls. The laws of the State of New York and the dignity of the tribunal had been shockingly violated, but no punishment was meted out. The criminal causes and an action for damages begun by the musical critic of the newspaper dribbled along until they were lost in the sands of time. And Miss Garden and Miss Cavalieri both signed contracts with Mr. Hammerstein for the next season.

On January 28, 1909, in the midst of the painful perturbations which I have recorded "Salomé" was produced in a French version at the Manhattan Opera House, and Miss Garden had an opportunity to divest herself of her clothing piecemeal in the presence of a public with a well whetted curiosity. The story of the first production of the opera at the Metropolitan Opera House, and its suppression at the command of the directors and the owners of that institution in the season of 1906-'07, is fully told in my book, "Chapters of Opera." Had the original production been spared the interference of the Metropolitan directors the question of the attitude of New York's music lovers toward the work would soon have been settled and the public been spared Mr. Hammerstein's revamping of the unsavory mess.

It was no secret in January, 1907, among those familiar with operatic affairs that a failure of the drama was presaged by the small sale of seats for the representations projected by Mr. Conried and diligently kept before the public while the controversy between Mr. Conried and the Metropolitan Opera and Real Estate Company was raging. It is very likely that the astute Mr. Hammerstein saw the handwriting on the wall at the time for three or four days after the work had been performed, and while the question of its withdrawal was still pending he told me that he had declined to purchase the performing rights in the preceding summer, partly on the advice of Madame Lili Lehmann, and that he was glad he had done so, adding that he would not produce "Salome" even if Mr. Conried surrendered the performing rights.

Why Mr. Hammerstein Changed His Mind

The reason of his subsequent change of mind is not far to seek, nor need we attach any more importance to his broken purpose than Jove is said to do to lovers' perjuries. Mr. Hammerstein would not have thought of producing "Salome" if it had not been for the opportunity which it gave for that association to which most that made appeal to his public was due. The curiosity which was potent enough to fill his theatre at doubled prices of admission was directed not to the play of Wilde, not to the musical investiture of that play by Richard Strauss, but to Mary Garden, and to her chiefly because of the lascivious dance. Mr. Conried had felt the public pulse and renounced his project with but little show of unwillingness. There was talk by him and the directors of his company of transferring the performances to another theatre; but it dribbled away. So did the proclaimed purpose to give it "on the road." So did the announced intention to give a long series of representations before the subscription season of 1907-'08. Mr. Conried surrendered his rights in the drama at what must have been a large pecuniary sacrifice; and within a year or so Mr. Hammerstein acquired them.

Why? After his own utterances on the subject I cannot believe that he had become convinced that the withdrawal of the work from the repertory of the Metropolitan Opera House had left the public hungering with so consuming a hunger that to satisfy it was either an artistic duty or a promising financial enterprise. No. A new factor had entered into the proposition. Miss Garden wanted to be seen in the titular rôle, convinced that by her acting, dancing and disrobing she could achieve the success which had not looked with propitious eye upon the first production. Moreover, Miss Garden's vision was not directed upon New York alone. Paris had welcomed Miss Fremstad's moving dramatic impersonation and hailed her interpretation of the music with delight. Even if Miss Garden could not hope to cope with Miss Fremstad's singing she could outdo her acting if she were to do the dance of the seven veils herself, and not by proxy, as Miss Fremstad had done it, and thus throw a shamelessly generous exhibition of her body into the balance. Miss Garden could not sing in German, however, nor could any of her associates at the Manhattan Opera House. So the project was evolved of performing the drama in French, a proceeding which did not seem very revolutionary since Oscar Wilde had originally written "Salome" in that language, and the English version, which had failed to gain a foothold in Great Britain and America and the German which had ravaged Germany were both translations. Paris heard "Salome" in German; New York was the first city in the world to hear it in French.

This sounds somewhat paradoxical and perverse; but perversion is the theme of "Salome" in all its elements, and to discuss it anew because of one added aspect would scarcely be worth while. Nor is there much need of discussion of the effect of a French text upon the music. By the composer's own confession words and the human voice were tolerated by him only as necessary evils. Against his will was he compelled to consort with the earth-born babblers of articulate speech. Naturally there was one viewpoint from which the association of such music as this with the French language seemed anomalous. Elegance of expression is inherent in all forms of French art; dramatic truthfulness and vigor, sometimes to the verge of uncouthness, of German. The nervous chatter of Burrian's German Herod was much more characteristic of the neurasthenic created by Strauss than was the better cadenced and more or less tuneful singing of Dalmores's Tetrarch.

But this was largely a matter of interpretation. The French artist would not miss an opportunity to sing a phrase if it offered itself; the German was willing to sacrifice everything to an illumination of the pathological nature of Herod's pitiful case. As for the preachments and denunciations of Joachanan in which is contained the bulk of the sustained music of the score, except the final beatification of the necrophilism of the unspeakable Salome, they did not seem to be either helped or hindered by the change of tongue. The stage-set was beautiful though the picture was marred by incongruities and anachronisms such as the introduction of the familiar winged bull of Assyria into Herod's palace. The light effects were of great beauty and the people of the play magnificently caparisoned. The color scheme was more garish than in Mr. Conried's production and there was more than a suggestion of barbarism in the habiliments of Herod, but these high lights only served to accentuate the beauty of Miss Garden's person and raiment. Of the latter, however, there was very little, and in the climax of the dance the utmost limit ever reached by a lyric artist or actress within a long memory was attained. To have thrown off any more in emulation of Istar she would have been obliged to doff her cuticle.

Its Reception Outside of New York

For the sake of history the story of the opera's career outside of New York may be briefly rehearsed. Mr. Hammerstein announced it in his prospectuses for Philadelphia and Boston. In the former city the Methodist and Baptist clergymen made an energetic protest. The Presbyterians followed on the eve of the opening of the opera house, adopting a preamble and resolutions which described the work as "a realistic portrayal of the immoral motives that resulted in the bloody tragedy of John the Baptist" and "inconsistent with that sacred reverence which all Christians cherish for that godly man." Committees of the Christian League and the State and County Federation of Catholic Societies sent a letter to the Mayor of the city on the day before that set for the performance.

The Mayor not only declined to interfere, but was chairman of a committee of citizens who gave a complimentary dinner to Mr. Hammerstein on the evening of the day. The manager announced that he would produce "Salome," and his purpose was applauded. A week later he announced that the last performance would be on March 1. He did not dare longer withstand the undercurrent of dissent among his subscribers. In Boston the presentation of the opera was opposed by Eben S. Draper, Governor of Massachusetts; George A. Hibbard, Mayor of the city; Bishop Lawrence, of the Protestant Episcopal Church; Vicar-General George J. Patterson, of the Roman Catholic Church; George A. Gordon, of the Trinitarian body; ex-Governor Curtis Guild and other prominent citizens. The representatives of the churches were especially indignant because the date of the projected performance had been set in Holy Week. Hammerstein withdrew the opera.

The Rival Participants in the "Thais" Wrangle

Mary Garden

Lina Cavalieri © Mishkin

In the Midst of the Garden-Cavalieri Fracas "Salome" Is Revived, for Miss Garden's Benefit

No Speed Limit on the Trail of Sedition

THE convicted I. W. W. are already in Leavenworth, Eugene Debs is under a ten-year sentence, "The Masses" trial looms up ahead again, Mrs. Stokes comes once more into notice as a spectator at the Debs trial, John Reed adds a second bond to his first to retain his liberty after a fiery speech on Russia, and Villard's "Nation" slips into the government's toils and out again after alleged Presidential intervention. The government doesn't dally in its pursuit of seditious utterances. The telegram of a "leading New York newspaper," giving warning that it will no longer reprint utterances branded as seditious, even in giving the news, is issued by the Postoffice Department as a guide for other publications to follow.

Debs has been released under $10,000 bail, pending the decision on his appeal. He will not, however, be allowed to make the speech in Madison Square Garden at the mass meeting which was scheduled there for September 30. His conviction followed a speech delivered June 16 of this year at the Ohio State Socialist convention at Canton. The former Socialist candidate for President is quoted as saying he found no fault with the fairness of the trial. "The New York Evening Post" commented:

"Thus does Mr. Debs acquit the government of any misuse of its power in applying the espionage law to his case. His statement follows hard upon similar declarations by both defendants and observers in connection with the trial of members of the I. W. W. at Chicago. This demonstration of ability to keep the processes of justice untainted by passion is highly gratifying. At a time when feeling is tense it would be easy for overzealous officials to arrest persons upon untenable grounds and for popular excitement to demand their conviction merely because of utterances that went contrary to the prevailing opinion. We have the best authority for it that in the most conspicuous trials under the espionage act thus far held counsel, court and jury were guided solely by the law and the evidence."

"The St. Louis Republic," remembering the programme that the Socialist party launched in St. Louis, speaks in this wise:

"The conviction of Eugene Debs, like that of Mrs. Stokes at Kansas City and 'Bill' Haywood and his I. W. W. followers in Chicago, will be received with satisfaction throughout the country. It is a warning to all the loose-thinking and loud-talking tribe that the people of the United States do not purpose to have their war efforts diverted or wasted by dissensions such as would inevitably follow the encouragement of Bolshevism in this country.

"In his address to the jury at Cleveland Debs tried to make it appear that he was being tried for adherence to the doctrines of socialism and the St. Louis platform. Such is not the case. He was tried on specific charges of violation of the espionage act and had every opportunity to establish his innocence. Before the law he deserved, and received, no more consideration as Debs, the Presidential candidate, than any plain citizen would have received. So far as the St. Louis platform is concerned, it is one of the things bearing its name of which St. Louis distinctly is not proud or responsible for. It was adopted before the United States entered the war by a body of men who called themselves Socialists, but whose efforts have been denounced by real Socialists as pro-Germanism in disguise."

"The Chicago Daily News" does not differ in its arraignment of Debs:

"The conviction of Debs was unavoidable in the circumstances. He may have sought martyrdom—he said in court that he was willing to die for his ideas—but neither the law nor sound reason would countenance seditious license for fanatics and doctrinaires. Those who, like Debs or Mrs. Rose Pastor Stokes, refuse to help democracy in its struggle against predatory militarism must refrain at least from hampering the nation's efforts or otherwise giving aid and comfort to the enemy. Mrs. Stokes, by the way, though under sentence for a similar violation of the law, was present in court throughout the trial and was bold enough to applaud Debs' harangue in his own behalf, this being quite possible under our 'tyrannical' legal system, including our terrible provisions for bail and appeal.

"Mild and lax as is our legal procedure—again witness Mrs. Stokes—it would be suicidal to tolerate open, contumacious defiance of the laws of the land, especially at a time when thousands of Americans are making the supreme sacrifice in vindication of democratic government and the supremacy of law founded on justice."

"The Seattle Post-Intelligencer" presents an interesting review of the Debs conviction, pointing out the place Debs holds among American radical politicians:

"History will attach more importance to the conviction of Eugene V. Debs than the facts of the incident warrant, for Debs today is more a man of record than of reality. Thrice a candidate for the Presidency, a lecturer and a writer, he possesses all the outward semblances of a national character, whereas in reality he is and has been for years hardly more than a figurehead even in the Socialist party. His recurrent candidacy for the Presidency was, of course, nothing more than a matter of form, in which he served as a means of taking a census of the party, which found its actual leadership in other men, such as Spargo, Hillquit, Berger, et al.

"The development of Debs from a locomotive fireman to the titular head of a party of protest, with a brief excursion into the realms of practical politics and officeholding, would be an interesting topic in more leisurely times. At present, however, we have only the time and the temper for considering him as an agent of sedition and an enemy of the country. Hardly is it worth our while to speculate on the quality of the motives that have brought him to his present predicament. Whether he is a sincere victim of his own delusions or an opinionated doctrinaire incapable of viewing the present situation in the light of present facts is immaterial to us in our hour of emergency. We do know that men of his party, such as Spargo or Upton Sinclair, men as loyal to their class and ideals as he, men his mental equals and even his intellectual superiors, have found the dangers confronting the world sufficiently imminent to bring them shoulder to shoulder with those whom they formerly opposed, in order to safeguard the principles of liberty that are common to all subdivisions of democracy. In doing this these Socialists have not recanted one clause of their faith in socialism; they have not apostasized or deserted. They have simply realized that every form of individual freedom, as distinguished from dynastic and bureaucratic autocracy, is at stake in the struggle now going on, and have sunk their minor differences in the cause of freedom's safety.

"Debs is, for one reason or the other, incapable of this reasonable conduct. It may be that he, like Mrs. Stokes, prefers the rôle of a martyr, with all its satisfactions and sustenances, to the more humdrum one of common sense. Or it may be that, confident in his superior wisdom, Debs looks pityingly down on the nation and, more in sorrow than in anger, awaits the day when some hundred million citizens will come contritely to ask his forgiveness.

"In the meantime it is the cause of not a little satisfaction to know that we have a country so strong in its purpose, so united in its determination, that men like Debs and Haywood are calmly brought to the bar of justice, accorded a fair and dispassionate trial and sentenced without malice or fear. Such incidents reveal the qualities of a true democracy, calm and clear thinking in a world of distraction. Such a democracy is well worth our blood and our treasure."

"The New York Call," a Socialist newspaper, is moved to utterance by the fact that the temporary suppression of an issue of "The Nation" caused little comment in New York newspapers. This is what "The Call" says about the matter:

"Even the news that the grandson of the abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, had succeeded in getting the issue released in the mails did not provoke a single editorial in the dailies congratulating the editor for the successful issue of the struggle. A fundamental civil right hung in the balance for a week. Here was an opportunity for the editorial hosts that have volunteered in the struggle for democracy. They failed, and failed miserably. We never have been surprised that they ignored the case of "The Call" in this same struggle. Though we, too, never have been allured by the German Junkers; though we never have, in a single line, given comfort to those who dream the pan-German dream, we can understand why, as a Socialist publication, these dailies should ignore our struggle. There is no reason why they shouldn't support even our struggle, for freedom of the press as guaranteed in the Constitution contains no Socialist exceptional clause. But we can understand their attitude, we repeat.

"'The Nation,' however, is a non-Socialist publication. In its brilliant career it has taken a critical attitude toward Socialism, though on a higher plane than our daily contemporaries. The struggle of Oswald Garrison Villard was their struggle and the struggle of the American people. It was a struggle for a fundamental civil right, a struggle for a phase of democracy without which no democracy is possible. Yet this editor was deserted, and even his success brings only a few inches of space in the news columns of these publications."

Colonel Harvey thus launches an editorial in his "War Weekly":

"Well, sir, we never expected to live to see the day when Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard would be forbidden by the Administration of President Woodrow Wilson to send his papers through the mails. How times and customs and manners do change!"